

to secure recognition for decent colored men by giving them appointments in their own northern communities."

To Mr. George F. Spinney, of New York City,
on
January 22, 1907:

"I have had a perfectly comic time with the Senate. They have been hopping^ about, insisting that they could not desert Foraker, because it would 'split the party'; and I finally told the most active of the compromisers that if they split off Foraker they split off a splinter; but if they split off me they would split the party nearly in two; and that I should state most unhesitatingly, and whenever it became necessary in public, that the opposition to me on Brownsville was simply a cloak to cover antagonism to my actions about trusts, swollen fortunes and the like. I added that this opposition would be shown by voting against the Blackburn amendment. Once this declaration was made, Foraker was left so completely without support that he actually came into line himself, and agreed to support an amendment a little stronger than the Blackburn amendment. That is, the Blackburn amendment merely said that they did not question the legality of my action; whereas the proposed amendment stated that they questioned neither the legality nor the justice of my action. I was sorry that Foraker was allowed the chance to offer the amendment, and it was against my earnest advice that the senators who were on my side permitted him to do so. But when he 'ate crow*' and took the very amendment upon

which I insisted, I did not see how I could
make any open
protest against it. There never has been a
more complete
case of backdown and humiliation than this of
Foraker 's."

I was stationed in Washington at the time
and when
talking with the President one morning I
made a reference
to the Brownsville debate in the Senate.
"Oh," he said,
"that is merely the latest log going down the
stream."
When in January following there appeared in
the *Century*
magazine, an article by him on "The Ancient
Irish Sagas,"